R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 048 CG 000 035

THE EVALUATION OF REHABILITATION COUNSELOR PERFORMANCE--A SURVEY OF STATE AGENCY PRACTICES.

BY- MUTHARD, JOHN E. MILLER, LEONARD A.
IOWA UNIV., IOWA CITY, COLL. OF EDUCATION

PUB DATE 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.32 33P.

DESCRIPTORS- *REHABILITATION COUNSELING, *COUNSELOR EVALUATION, REHABILITATION PROGRAMS, *STATISTICAL SURVEYS, *STATE PROGRAMS, VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION, *COUNSELOR PERFORMANCE, EVALUATION METHODS, RANK ORDER CORRELATION, IOWA CITY

A QUESTIONNAIRE, SENT TO DIRECTORS OF 89 PUBLIC, STATE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION AGENCIES AND OF AGENCIES WHICH SERVE THE BLIND, WAS DESIGNED PRIMARILY TO SURVEY PRESENT PRACTICES USED IN EVALUATING COUNSELORS ON THEIR STAFF. MULTIPLE-CHOICE-TYPE QUESTIONS REQUIRED TWO TYPES OF ANSWERS--THE VARIOUS COUNSELOR CHARACTERISTICS CONSIDERED OR REQUIRED IN EVALUATIONS AND HOW IMPORTANT SUCH CHARACTERISTICS WERE THOUGHT TO BE. NINETY-SEVEN PERCENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES WERE RETURNED. FINDINGS SHOWED THAT THE GENERAL EVALUATION PRACTICES OF THESE AGENCIES USUALLY FOLLOWED STANDARD PERSONNEL PRACTICES, EXCEPT THAT ALMOST HALF OF THE AGENCIES LACK A STANDARD COUNSELOR EVALUATION FORM. THE 29 COUNSELOR CHARACTERISTICS WHICH WERE RATED ON IMPORTANCE, REQUIREDNESS, AND METHOD OF ASSESSMENT WERE CLUSTERED INTO THREE CATEGORIES--PERSONAL, PERFORMANCE, AND ABILITY-KNOWLEDGE. OF THE THREE CLASSES, ABILITY-KNOWLEDGE QUALITIES ARE MORE OFTEN REQUIRED BY ALL TYPES AND SIZES OF AGENCIES. TWO APPROACHES TO MEASURING THE CONGRUENCE BETWEEN REQUIREDNESS AND IMPORTANCE OF COUNSELOR CHARACTERISTICS FOR LARGE, MEDIUM, AND SMALL AGENCIES SUGGEST THAT MEDIUM-SIZED AGENCIES ARE LESS CONGRUENT THAN OTHERS. THIS DOCUMENT WAS PUBLISHED IN "THE CRITERIA PROBLEM IN REHABILITATION COUNSELING" AS CHAPTER II (PP. 8-15), APPENDIX A (PP. 65-70), APPENDIX H (PP. 110-117), AND REFERENCES (PP. 123-129). (PS)

CG 000 035

ED012048

THE CRITERIA PROBLEM IN REHABILITATION COUNSELING

John E. Muthard

and

Leonard A. Miller

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

College of Education
THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
Iowa City, Iowa

1966

CG 000 035

CHAPTER II

THE EVALUATION OF REHABILITATION COUNSELOR PERFORMANCE: A SURVEY OF STATE AGENCY PRACTICES

Problem

In 1960, as part of our study on the criteria problem in evaluating the work of the rehabilitation counselor, a questionnaire (Appendix A) was sent to the directors of 89 public state vocational rehabilitation agencies (DVR). This questionnaire was designed primarily to survey present practices used in evaluating counselors on their staff. Our intent was to collect data about present practices which would both prepare for later stages of the study and have immediate significance to administrators and other researchers.

Methods

In planning this survey, we decided to collect information about (1) the general features of current evaluation procedures; (2) the extent to which various counselor characteristics were considered or required in evaluations; (3) how important the characteristics were thought to be; and (4) the methods or approaches currently used in evaluating counselors. The final form of the questionnaire included eight general multiple-choice questions and 29 specific multiple-choice questions.

The process for developing 29 specific items of the questionnaire was as follows: In the Jaques study (1959), supervisors in public rehabilitation agencies responded to the question: "What are the things which you believe DIFFERENTIATE a good rehabilitation counselor from a poor one?" By examining these responses and eliminating those which were the same or overlapped to a great extent, we determined the qualities which supervisors thought were distinguishing

characteristics of a "good" counselor or his performance. Five judges sorted the specific questions into three categories: (1) personal traits or personality-type features; (2) task or job performance qualities; and (3) ability-knowledge type characteristics. The mean inter-judge agreement was 90 per cent. Only items which had four or more judges agreeing on a category are reported in this study; consequently, item 20 of the questionnaire is not included in the tables. The eight general questions were included to study general practices associated with counselor evaluation.

The questionnaire was tested and criticized by several administrators before use. It was found that due to the "social desirability" of almost all traits, the method of responding had to be adjusted. For example, the labels for "importance" categories ("extremely," "quite," "slightly") had to be "boosted" before they began to discriminate. We also had to change the "required" categories to make them more acceptable and to secure more dispersion in responses.

Our survey covered both DVR* and agencies which serve the blind. From this population, we received a return of 86 questionnaires (97 per cent of total), all of which were usable after further follow-up. Since our return was so high, we did not use sampling statistics in the analysis and interpretation of results.

A breakdown of the agencies is as follows:

		Number
DVR Agencies (by type)		
DVR Comb. (Combined agencies serving both blind and others)		16
DVR Sep. (Separate agencies, not serving the blind)		35
	TOTAL	51
DVR Agencies (by size)		
DVR Size 1 (Having 0-19 counselors on staff)		18
DVR Size 2 (Having 20-39 counselors on staff)		17
DVR Size 3 (Having 40 or more counselors on staff)		16
	TOTAL	51
Blind Agencies	TOTAL	35
All Agencies Surveyed (by region)		
Region Northeast (NE) VRA Regions 1 and 2		19
Region South (S) VRA Regions 3, 4 and 7		26
Region Midwest (MW) VRA Regions 5 and 6		21
Region West (W) VRA Regions 8 and 9		20
	TOTAL	86

*DVR is used throughout to designate the state-federal general vocational rehabilitation program.

Results

General Questions: The results from general questions concerning evaluation procedures as a whole are given in Table 1. This table - as all of the tables used in this chapter - gives the percentages of agency responses, rounded to the nearest hundredth, in the most significant categories available to the respondent. Since each table contains a considerable amount of information, we shall not examine the material in detail, but rather concentrate on the more obvious and overall characteristics.

TABLE 1

GENERAL PRACTICES IN COUNSELOR EVALUATION
WITHIN STATE REHABILITATION AGENCIES

Question	All Agencies (N=86)	DVR (N=51)	Blind (N=35)
1. How often are the rehabilitation counselors on your staff evaluated?			
No set time	23%	33%	9%
Every 3 to 6 months	17%	16%	20%
Every 7 months to 1 year	56%	47%	69%
At intervals of over 1 year	4%	4%	3%
2. Do these reports become a part of the rehabilitation counselor's record?			
Yes	79%	73%	89%
No	20%	25%	11%
Didn't answer	1%	2%	
3. Are such counselor reports used to determine pay increases?			
Yes	38%	29%	52%
No	19%	24%	11%
Partially used	43%	47%	37%
4. Are the reports used to determine promotions?			
Yes	35%	31%	40%
No	9%	11%	6%
Partially used	56%	58%	54%
5. Does your staff use a standard form to organize reports on the counselors they evaluate?			
Yes	59%	51%	71%
No	41%	49%	29%
6. Do supervisors have a responsibility to review their reports with the counselors involved?			
Yes	83%	80%	86%
No	17%	20%	14%

Question	All Agencies (N=86)	DVR (N=51)	Blind (N=35)
7. Are the evaluative reports used to establish in-service training goals?			
Often used	36%	31%	43%
Occasionally used	38%	41%	34%
Seldom used	23%	24%	23%
Didn't answer	2%	4%	
8. When was the last time a major change occured in your evaluative procedures?			
Within past 6 months	11%	16%	3%
Within past year	20%	25%	11%
Within past 5 years	31%	24%	43%
Over 5 years	34%	31%	37%
Didn't answer	5%	4%	6%

From Table 1, we made the following generalizations: (1) the most frequent interval used by agencies in evaluating counselors is seven months to one year; (2) agencies for the blind are markedly more definite about their rating intervals; (3) although most agencies make evaluative reports part of the counselor's record, and make use of some of them to determine pay increases and promotions, Blind agencies report a higher percentage doing this than do general agencies; (4) only about one-half of the DVR agencies and three-fourths of the Blind agencies have a standard form in organizing reports on counselors; however, most agencies require that supervisors review their reports with the counselors evaluated; (5) 61 per cent of all agencies use such reports only "occasionally" or "seldom" in establishing in-service training goals; Blind agencies again report a higher percentage, using them "often" in such a way; and (6) a third of all agencies made a major change in evaluative procedures over five years ago; another third within the past five years but not within the last year (1960); DVR agencies made changes more recently than did agencies serving the blind.

Evaluative Questions: The summary of our findings from the 29 specific evaluative questions presented to state agency heads is given in Appendix H. Tables A-F indicate whether or not a characteristic was systematically required by the agency's evaluative procedures and how important each quality was deemed in the evaluation process. For importance ratings, there was a choice of three responses: EI (Extremely Important), QI (Quite Important), or SI (Slightly Important). Tables B, D and F show the percentages of agencies indicating each category (personal trait, performance, and ability-knowledge) as being extremely important. In Table G, we list the median percentages for each of the three categories required and regarded as extremely important. This table groups agencies by type of client served, size (DVR only), and region. What this table might tell us will become more clear as we go along.

Requiredness Ratings of Agencies

Personal Traits: Whether or not personal traits are required in evaluative procedures seems associated with agency size. Five qualities (appearance and grooming, enthusiasm and interest, use of experience and mistakes, desire to correct shortcomings, and resourcefulness and ingenuity) were required by fewer large (DVR Size 3) agencies than small (DVR Size 1) agencies. On three of the traits (regard and conduct as a professional person, understanding of own needs, beliefs and limitations, and "getting along" with co-workers), the larger agencies (DVR Size 3) report a greater percentage requiring them than do DVR Size 1.

State agencies for the rehabilitation of the blind are, on the whole, more concerned than are general or combined agencies with the evaluation of counselor personal trait characteristics. However, these agencies have a higher median percentage on all three evaluation categories. If we accept the notion that the median percentage is representative of the extent to which a particular group of agencies requires a certain characteristic, this would mean that more Blind agencies require all three. From Table G, we can also note that personal traits are generally required less than performance or ability-knowledge qualities by all types of agency.

Performance Qualities: The factor of size appears to influence whether or not a trait is required in evaluative procedures. On three of them (creation of a suitable atmosphere during counseling sessions, respect for the confidentiality of certain information, and preparation and motivation of clients for job hunting), larger agencies report the smallest percentages. Larger agencies more frequently require neatness and care in handling mechanics and clerical tasks, counselor's placement efforts, and presentation of an "agency image" to the community.

Ability-Knowledge Qualities: For all agency groups, median percentages (Table G) are highest on this type. Ability-knowledge questions were used to the greatest extent throughout all agencies in the evaluation of counselors. One trait (ability to reason logically and concisely) was required more often by the smaller agencies.

Importance of Evaluation Items

Personal Traits, Performance, Ability-Knowledge Qualities: Rather than discuss each characteristic in detail, we suggest that the reader turn to the tables themselves. On ratings of extreme importance, we do not find as marked a difference between DVR Separate and Blind agencies except on performance. Here again in the Blind agencies there is more emphasis on placement activities, confidentiality, atmosphere for counseling, and giving appropriate information to clients.

Relation of Requiredness to Importance: One question raised was: Are required qualities also those judged to be extremely important? An answer to this would tell us to what extent agency groups were congruent in terms of requiring traits they judged to be extremely important. Agencies might require an ability

for administrative reasons, due to size of staff, but not feel it was extremely important from a professional standpoint. On the other hand, they might judge it extremely important but, due to the difficulty of measuring it, not require it. The phi coefficients given in Table 2 are one possible index of congruence. They show that the smallest agencies are most congruent and the middle-sized agencies least congruent for our three performance evaluation categories.

TABLE 2

THE MEDIAN RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE REQUIRED AND EXTREME IMPORTANCE CATEGORIES IN THE EVALUATION OF COUNSELORS BY DVR'S

Quality	DVR Size 1	DVR Size 2	DVR Size 3	Blind	DVR Total
Median Personal Trait	34*	17	28	35	20
Median Performance	48	24	25	25	38
Median Ability-Knowledge	40	-01	22	23	23

Another approach to measuring the amount of congruence between requiredness of a quality and judgment of extreme importance within a specific class of agencies is rank-order correlation. When the items were rank-ordered by percentage requiring the trait and then by percentage judging it extremely important, we found the DVR's, Sizes 1, 2 and 3, arranged themselves in the same order secured when median phi coefficients were used to assess the relationship between congruence and size; that is, DVR Size 1 (.78) has the most, DVR Size 3 (.60) is next, and DVR Size 2 (.50) has the least.

One possible interpretation of the lower congruence for agencies of middle size (20-39 counselors) may be that they are in an "overlapping" situation when it comes to evaluating their staff. The staff has grown too large to be evaluated on the "personal" basis used when it was smaller, and these expanding agencies are struggling to develop new criteria for evaluation. Smaller agencies have not met these problems yet, while the largest agencies have already adopted new solutions to some extent. Within DVR Size 2 agencies, meanwhile, some have moved on to new criteria, some cling to old ones. Subsequently, they do not report as uniformly as the other two groups. This is <u>not</u> to say that evaluation problems are necessarily resolved in the best manner in small and large agencies, but only that they show higher relationship between requiring qualities and regarding them as extremely important. Overall, Table 2 shows us that such a relationship is rather low for the most part, regardless of size or type of agency.

In Table 3, we find that DVR's, Sizes 1, 2 and 3, arrange themselves in the same order secured when median phi coefficients were used to assess the relationship between congruence and size. That is, DVR Size 1 (.78) has the most, DVR

---

*Decimals have been omitted from correlations.

Size 3 (.60) is next, and DVR Size 2 (.50) has the least. We have also included in Table 3 the rhos for various other agency groups. The low rho (.14) of Region NE is rather difficult to interpret, at least from the information we now possess. In terms of agency sizes and numbers of Blind versus DVR agencies, that region is quite similar to Region W (which is highest).

TABLE 3

THE RANK ORDER CORRELATION BETWEEN REQUIRED AND EXTREMELY IMPORTANT PERCENTAGES FOR EVALUATION QUALITIES ACCORDING TO CLASS OF DVR

	Rho		Rho
DVR Comb.	75*	Blind Agencies	55
DVR Sep.	77	Region NE	14
DVR Size 1	78	Region S	62
DVR Size 2	50	Region MW	62
DVR Size 3	60	Region W	77

Similarity of Different Agency Classes: In this section, we shall consider how similar one category of agency is to another, rather than focusing on differences or the amount of congruence within an agency group. One measure of similarity would be the relationships between the rank orders of items by percentage requiring those items and the same figures for extremely important percentages. Table H (Appendix H) gives such information. Agencies closest in size were most similar in the qualities they, as a group, required in evaluations. For example, all Blind agencies are Size 1, except one which is Size 2. Size 1 DVR agencies correlated the highest with Blind agencies. On extremely important judgments, agencies followed the same pattern. Since two groups of agencies might rank-order traits similarly but be quite far apart on actual percentages upon which the ranks were established, we also computed an index of similarity which takes level into account as well. The generalized distance formula was used for this purpose.

Size was found to be related to how similar the agency groups were in requiring characteristics for evaluation. This holds as well between DVR and Blind agencies. On extremely important judgments, size does not appear related to the amount of similarity when level is taken into account as well.

Assessment Method: In responding to the questionnaire used in this survey, a respondent also indicated the principal method used in assessing each of the 29 evaluation characteristics. He had a choice of five responses in terms of methods used: CR (Case Review), SI (Supervisor Impressions), SR (Supervisor Rating Blank), D (some sort of Device, such as a standardized test), and O (Other method not given). Since three of the choices (CR, SI and SR) accounted for practically all

---

*Decimals are omitted from correlations.

the percentages, only these three are given in Table 4. Supervisor Impressions was the most frequently used procedure for assessing 23 out of the 29 evaluations, in both DVR and Blind agencies. (Table I in Appendix H presents the figures for each trait.)

From Table 4, we can see that Supervisor Impressions is the dominant method of evaluation for all types of characteristics. Case Review, as one might expect, is used to the greatest extent in assessing performance traits.

TABLE 4

THE MEAN PROPORTION OF TIMES EACH OF THREE MAJOR COUNSELOR EVALUATION METHODS ARE USED BY STATE DVR AGENCIES FOR ASSESSING THREE TYPES OF EVALUATION CHARACTERISTICS

	SI	CR	SR
Personal Traits	81.2%	11.4%	4.0%
Performance	50.7%	36.8%	5.3%
Ability-Knowledge	55.3%	27.5%	9.8%

Summary

Survey data describing DVR counselor evaluation practices were obtained from 86 of the 89 agencies polled. Our findings showed that the general evaluation practices of these agencies usually followed standard personnel practices except that almost half of the agencies lack a standard counselor evaluation form. The 29 counselor characteristics for which we secured importance, requiredness, and method of assessment data were clustered into three categories: personal, performance, and ability-knowledge. Of the three classes, ability-knowledge qualities are more often required by all types and sizes of agency. Two approaches to measuring the congruence between requiredness and importance of counselor characteristics for large, medium and small agencies (according to number of counselors) suggest that medium-sized agencies are less congruent than the others.

APPENDIX A

PERSONNEL EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Purpose

This questionnaire is one phase of a larger study concerned with criteria for rehabilitation counseling. It aims to obtain from rehabilitation agencies information regarding the evaluative questions and procedures they use to assess their professional staff. From this survey, we expect to learn which aspects of rehabilitation counseling administrators take into account in their evaluative decision. The most common areas will be applied, along with a performance record rating procedure in the final part of our study.

Format of Questionnaire

Most of the items to be considered in the questionnaire are in the form of a question. They are meant to help you to quickly identify questions you do or do not concern yourself with in an evaluation of your staff. At the end of the questionnaire, there are several brief "general" questions which concern your evaluative procedures as a whole.

How to Respond to Question Items

After reading an item, you are asked to respond in three ways to that item:

1. To indicate whether or not this is a question that evaluators (supervisors, etc.) are required to ask in present counselor evaluation procedures, ENCIRCLE:

   "R" - if this is a question that is required in present evaluative procedures; i.e., it is a question which appears in the agency's operational manual or standard personnel rating forms.

   "NR" - if this is a question that is not required in present evaluative procedures, but may be occasionally asked or considered.

   "?" - if you do not know if it is required or if it is hard to determine whether the question is covered by the agency's regular practices.

2. To indicate how important you feel an item is in your evaluation of professional staff, ENCIRCLE:

   "EI" - if you feel it is extremely important.

   "QI" - if you feel it is quite important but not extremely important.

   "SI" - if you feel it is slightly important.

3. To indicate how data is collected and organized on a particular item; i.e., what techniques do you use to assess whether or not the staff member does possess this characteristic. To indicate the procedure, ENCIRCLE:

"CR" - if case records are reviewed and evaluated.

"SI" - if supervisor impressions of the member and his work are used.

"SR" - if supervisor impressions, according to some standard rating form, are used.

"D" - if some test device, such as standardized tests, is used.

"O" - if some technique other than the above is used.

Where you need to encircle more than one technique, please put an "X" (e.g. (X)) through the principal technique used.

Sample Item

Required		Importance	Method Used
R (NR) ?	Does the counselor present a suitable appearance and good grooming?	EI (QI) SI	CR (SI) SR D O

Here, we see that the response indicates it is a question that is not required in staff evaluation but may be occasionally considered. It is believed to be quite important and generally is answered through supervisor impressions.

Please give your opinion of the importance of each item regardless of whether that question is required in your evaluation procedures. When you consider whether or not a question is required in your counselor evaluation procedures, it may be helpful to you to ask yourself, "How do I know that this particular question is considered?"

Thank you for your help in making this study possible. We shall be very happy to make the results available to you.

	Required				Importance			Method Used				
1.	R	NR	?	Does the counselor present a suitable appearance and good grooming?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
2.	R	NR	?	Does the counselor demonstrate ability to reason logically and concisely?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
3.	R	NR	?	Does the counselor show enthusiasm and interest in his job?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
4.	R	NR	?	Does the counselor have an adequate knowledge of rehabilitation concepts? (medical, psychological, vocational, etc., as it relates to rehabilitation)	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
5.	R	NR	?	Does the counselor have the necessary experience or background to be an effective counselor?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
6.	R	NR	?	Does the counselor show neatness and care in handling the mechanics and clerical tasks of his job?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
7.	R	NR	?	Does the counselor regard and conduct himself as a professional person (ethics, professional association)?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
8.	R	NR	?	Does the counselor accept and benefit from supervision and criticism?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
9.	R	NR	?	Does the counselor learn from experience, and does he use his mistakes to strengthen his professional skills and understanding?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
10.	R	NR	?	Does the counselor understand how his own needs, beliefs, and personal limitations may affect his work with clients?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
11.	R	NR	?	Does the counselor create an atmosphere during counseling sessions with clients which makes it easier for them to deal with their problems and work with him?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
12.	R	NR	?	Does the counselor give clients appropriate information and in a manner which is meaningful to the client?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
13.	R	NR	?	Does the counselor show any fears or prejudices toward the disabled in general or toward certain disabilities?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O

	Required		Importance			Method Used				
14.	R NR ?	Does the counselor respect the confidentiality of certain information?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
15.	R NR ?	Does the counselor collect sufficient information before attempting an evaluation of a case?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
16.	R NR ?	Does the counselor evaluate the factors in the case and proceed to act judiciously to help the client toward his rehabilitation goals?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
17.	R NR ?	Does the counselor usually help clients to develop an understanding of the agency's goals and services?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
18.	R NR ?	Does the counselor learn from experience and show an attitude of wanting to correct his own shortcomings?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
19.	R NR ?	Does the counselor get along well with co-workers in the office and contribute to good office morale?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
20.	R NR ?	Does the counselor relate to other professional workers on a case in a cooperative and professional manner?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
21.	R NR ?	How effective are the counselor's placement efforts?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
22.	R NR ?	Does the counselor approach prospective employers in a way which enlists their interest and support of rehabilitation?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
23.	R NR ?	Does the counselor know the general goals of his agency and demonstrate an understanding of them?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
24.	R NR ?	Does the counselor know the limitations of his agency's services and abide by them?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
25.	R NR ?	Does the counselor meet the agency's required number of rehabilitations?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
26.	R NR ?	Does the counselor take advantage of opportunities to present an "agency image" to the community in line with agency goals?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O

	Required				Importance			Method Used				
27.	R	NR	?	Does the counselor demonstrate resourcefulness and ingenuity when confronted by a particularly difficult problem?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
28	R	NR	?	Does the counselor help prepare and motivate the client for job hunting?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O
29	R	NR	?	Does the counselor have substantial knowledge about, and working relationships with, the major community rehabilitation services and agencies?	EI	QI	SI	CR	SI	SR	D	O

II. The following questions relate to your total evaluation program. To answer them, simply check the appropriate foil.

1. How often are the rehabilitation counselors on your staff evaluated through some type of report?

   a. ____ no "set" time
   b. ____ every 3-6 months
   c. ____ every 7-12 months
   d. ____ at intervals of more than 1 year

2. Do these evaluative reports become a part of the rehabilitation counselor's record:

   Yes ____ No ____ Partially used ____

3. Are such counselor reports used to determine pay increases?

   Yes ____ No ____ Partially used ____

4. Are the reports used to determine promotions?

   Yes ____ No ____

5. Does your staff use a standard form to organize reports on the counselors they evaluate?

   Yes ____ No ____

6. Do supervisors have a responsibility to review their evaluation reports with the counselors involved?

   Yes ____ No ____

7. Are the evaluative reports used to establish in-service training goals?

   a. ____ often used
   b. ____ occasionally used
   c. ____ seldom used

8. When was the last time a major change occurred in your evaluative procedures?

   a. ____ within the last 6 months
   b. ____ within the last year
   c. ____ within the past 5 years
   d. ____ over 5 years ago

III. DATA SHEET

Position of respondent _____

1. Agency name _____ State _____

2. How many counselors are employed on your agency staff? _____

3. How many counselors on your staff have gone through a formal graduate program of rehabilitation counseling? _____

4. Is your agency under civil service? _____

Again, many thanks for your help. Please feel free to use the rest of this page in writing any comments or criticisms about this questionnaire or about evaluative procedures of rehabilitation counselors you might wish to include.

TABLE A

THE PROPORTION OF STATE-FEDERAL DVR'S WHICH REQUIRE CERTAIN PERSONAL TRAITS IN ASSESSING COUNSELORS

Clients Served			Size			Item	Region			
BLIND AGENCIES	DVR COMB.	DVR SEP.	DVR SIZE 1	DVR SIZE 2	DVR SIZE 3	REQUIRING the evaluation of:	REGION NE	REGION S	REGION MW	REGION W
69%	50%	49%	56%	59%	31%	1. The counselor's appearance and grooming.	68%	57%	47%	55%
63%	69%	60%	72%	59%	56%	3. The counselor's enthusiasm and interest.	68%	73%	42%	65%
63%	69%	71%	61%	76%	75%	7. The counselor's regard and conduct of himself as a professional person.	74%	77%	52%	65%
80%	56%	66%	56%	71%	63%	8. The counselor's acceptance and benefit from supervision and criticism.	63%	77%	67%	70%
74%	38%	54%	61%	59%	25%	9. The counselor's use of experience and mistakes to learn and improve skills.	63%	46%	67%	65%
46%	50%	29%	33%	24%	50%	10. The counselor's understanding of his own needs, beliefs and limitations.	42%	31%	24%	40%
40%	13%	40%	39%	18%	38%	13. The counselor's fears or prejudices toward the disabled or disabilities.	47%	27%	38%	30%
83%	31%	54%	50%	47%	44%	18. The counselor's desire to correct his own shortcomings.	68%	58%	62%	60%
74%	56%	63%	44%	65%	75%	19. The counselor's "getting along" with co-workers; contribution to morale.	68%	77%	62%	55%
66%	38%	51%	56%	41%	44%	27. The counselor's resourcefulness and ingenuity with a difficult problem.	63%	54%	43%	60%

TABLE B

THE PROPORTION OF STATE-FEDERAL DVR'S WHICH REGARD
CERTAIN PERSONAL TRAITS AS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT IN ASSESSING COUNSELORS

Clients Served			Size			Item	Region			
BLIND AGENCIES	DVR COMB.	DVR SEP.	DVR SIZE 1	DVR SIZE 2	DVR SIZE 3	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT to evaluate:	REGION NE	REGION S	REGION MW	REGION W
34%	31%	43%	67%	29%	19%	1. The counselor's appearance and grooming.	26%	27%	24%	30%
63%	75%	51%	67%	53%	56%	3. The counselor's enthusiasm and interest.	53%	69%	52%	65%
60%	81%	49%	56%	41%	81%	7. The counselor's regard and conduct of himself as a professional person.	53%	65%	52%	65%
54%	50%	63%	61%	53%	63%	8. The counselor's acceptance and benefit from supervision and criticism.	53%	46%	67%	65%
69%	75%	54%	67%	53%	63%	9. The counselor's use of experience and mistakes to learn and improve skills.	58%	69%	76%	50%
40%	50%	31%	28%	41%	44%	10. The counselor's understanding of his own needs, beliefs and limitations.	47%	27%	38%	45%
49%	38%	20%	22%	24%	31%	13. The counselor's fears or prejudices toward the disabled or disabilities.	47%	35%	29%	30%
69%	50%	54%	56%	47%	56%	18. The counselor's desire to correct his own shortcomings.	68%	58%	67%	45%
31%	69%	23%	33%	29%	50%	19. The counselor's "getting along" with co-workers; contribution to morale.	32%	42%	33%	30%
49%	56%	37%	44%	35%	50%	27. The counselor's resourcefulness and ingenuity with a difficult problem.	42%	38%	48%	55%

TABLE C

THE PROPORTION OF STATE-FEDERAL DVR'S WHICH REQUIRE CERTAIN PERFORMANCE QUALITIES IN ASSESSING COUNSELORS

Clients Served			Size			Item	Region			
BLIND AGENCIES	DVR COMB.	DVR SEP.	DVR SIZE 1	DVR SIZE 2	DVR SIZE 3	REQUIRING the evaluation of:	REGION NE	REGION S	REGION MW	REGION W
57%	56%	38%	56%	65%	63%	6. The counselor's neatness and care in handling mechanics and clerical tasks.	74%	58%	57%	50%
66%	69%	60%	78%	53%	56%	11. The counselor's creation of a suitable atmosphere during counseling sessions.	68%	65%	52%	70%
80%	69%	57%	67%	53%	63%	12. The counselor's giving of appropriate information to clients.	63%	73%	67%	70%
91%	75%	74%	83%	71%	69%	14. The counselor's respect for the confidentiality of certain information.	79%	92%	71%	80%
74%	69%	69%	67%	71%	69%	15. The counselor's collection of sufficient information before evaluating.	63%	81%	62%	75%
80%	81%	77%	78%	76%	81%	16. The counselor's evaluation of the factors in a case and acting judiciously.	68%	85%	71%	90%
66%	50%	54%	50%	59%	50%	17. The counselor's help to clients in developing an understanding of the agency.	68%	62%	57%	45%
69%	63%	51%	50%	53%	63%	21. The counselor's placement efforts.	58%	69%	43%	70%
71%	44%	46%	44%	47%	44%	22. The counselor's approach to prospective employers.	63%	50%	57%	50%
34%	13%	49%	33%	47%	31%	25. The counselor's meeting the agency's required number of rehabilitations.	53%	38%	29%	25%
43%	25%	34%	11%	41%	44%	26. The counselor's presentation of an "agency image" to the community.	47%	42%	38%	15%
74%	63%	66%	78%	65%	50%	28. The counselor's preparation and motivation of clients for job hunting.	68%	62%	67%	80%

TABLE D

THE PROPORTION OF STATE-FEDERAL DVR'S WHICH REGARD
CERTAIN PERFORMANCE QUALITIES AS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT IN ASSESSING COUNSELORS

Clients Served			Size			Item	Region			
BLIND AGENCIES	DVR COMB.	DVR SEP.	DVR SIZE 1	DVR SIZE 2	DVR SIZE 3	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT to evaluate:	REGION NE	REGION S	REGION MW	REGION W
14%	25%	9%	22%	12%	6%	6. The counselor's neatness and care in handling mechanics and clerical tasks.	16%	12%	10%	20%
77%	88%	60%	72%	47%	87%	11. The counselor's creation of a suitable atmosphere during counseling sessions.	68%	65%	86%	70%
69%	69%	54%	67%	47%	63%	12. The counselor's giving of appropriate information to clients.	74%	50%	67%	65%
83%	81%	69%	78%	53%	88%	14. The counselor's respect for the confidentiality of certain information.	74%	77%	76%	80%
74%	81%	68%	72%	71%	75%	15. The counselor's collection of sufficient information before evaluating.	63%	69%	76%	85%
71%	81%	71%	83%	65%	75%	16. The counselor's evaluation of the factors in a case and acting judiciously.	79%	50%	86%	85%
34%	38%	31%	28%	35%	38%	17. The counselor's help to clients in developing an understanding of the agency.	47%	23%	38%	30%
74%	63%	51%	61%	59%	44%	21. The counselor's placement efforts.	63%	54%	67%	70%
71%	63%	46%	61%	41%	50%	22. The counselor's approach to prospective employers.	50%	74%	57%	60%
31%	0%	23%	17%	18%	13%	25. The counselor's meeting the agency's required number of rehabilitations.	32%	15%	29%	15%
34%	25%	17%	6%	24%	31%	26. The counselor's presentation of an "agency image" to the community.	42%	19%	24%	20%
69%	56%	49%	67%	47%	38%	28. The counselor's preparation and motivation of clients for job hunting.	63%	42%	67%	65%

TABLE E

THE PROPORTION OF STATE-FEDERAL DVR'S WHICH REQUIRE CERTAIN ABILITY-KNOWLEDGE QUALITIES IN ASSESSING COUNSELORS

Clients Served			Size			Item	Region			
BLIND AGENCIES	DVR COMB.	DVR SEP.	DVR SIZE 1	DVR SIZE 2	DVR SIZE 3	REQUIRING the evaluation of:	REGION NE	REGION S	REGION MW	REGION W
86%	69%	63%	78%	53%	63%	2. The counselor's ability to reason logically and concisely.	79%	81%	57%	75%
83%	75%	74%	72%	76%	75%	4. The counselor's knowledge of rehabilitation concepts.	74%	85%	71%	80%
80%	75%	57%	67%	53%	69%	5. The counselor's experience and background to be an effective counselor.	68%	85%	48%	75%
89%	75%	71%	61%	82%	75%	23. The counselor's knowledge of the general goals of the agency.	63%	92%	67%	90%
74%	69%	69%	67%	65%	75%	24. The counselor's knowledge of the limitations of his agency's services.	68%	81%	67%	65%
74%	69%	69%	72%	65%	69%	29. The counselor's knowledge and relationships with major community agencies.	68%	77%	62%	75%

TABLE F

THE PROPORTION OF STATE-FEDERAL DVR'S WHICH REGARD
CERTAIN ABILITY-KNOWLEDGE QUALITIES AS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT IN ASSESSING COUNSELORS

Clients Served			Size			Item	Region			
BLIND AGENCIES	DVR COMB.	DVR SEP.	DVR SIZE 1	DVR SIZE 2	DVR SIZE 3	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT to evaluate:	REGION NE	REGION S	REGION MW	REGION W
77%	63%	71%	72%	71%	63%	2. The counselor's ability to reason logically and concisely.	79%	73%	57%	80%
83%	75%	86%	78%	82%	87%	4. The counselor's knowledge of rehabilitation concepts.	84%	81%	90%	75%
46%	63%	38%	56%	41%	63%	5. The counselor's experience and background to be an effective counselor.	42%	54%	43%	60%
60%	81%	71%	78%	71%	75%	23. The counselor's knowledge of the general goals of the agency.	68%	62%	71%	85%
54%	63%	66%	50%	76%	69%	24. The counselor's knowledge of the limitations of his agency's services.	47%	69%	71%	50%
57%	75%	51%	61%	59%	56%	29. The counselor's knowledge and relationships with major community agencies.	53%	54%	71%	55%

TABLE G

THE MEDIAN PERCENTAGES OF THREE QUALITIES REPORTED BY DVR'S AS REQUIRED AND EXTREMELY IMPORTANT, ACCORDING TO AGENCY, SIZE AND REGION

	BLIND AGENCIES	DVR COMB.	DVR.SEP.	DVR SIZE 1	DVR SIZE 2	DVR SIZE 3	REGION NE	REGION S	REGION MW	REGION W
Personal Trait Required	68%	50%	54%	56%	59%	47%	66%	58%	50%	60%
Personal Trait Important	52%	53%	47%	56%	44%	53%	50%	44%	50%	48%
Performance Required	73%	63%	56%	62%	56%	60%	68%	64%	57%	70%
Performance Important	70%	63%	50%	64%	47%	60%	63%	50%	67%	65%
Ability-Knowledge Required	82%	72%	69%	69%	65%	72%	68%	83%	65%	75%
Ability-Knowledge Important	59%	69%	69%	67%	71%	66%	61%	66%	71%	68%

TABLE H

THE CORRELATIONS BETWEEN DVR'S OF DIFFERENT CLASSIFICATION RANKED ACCORDING TO THE PROPORTION OF EVALUATION ITEMS REQUIRED AND JUDGED EXTREMELY IMPORTANT (rho)

	REQUIRED %	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT %
DVR Comb. and DVR Sep.	76*	69
DVR Comb. and Blind	52	65
DVR Sep. and Blind	67	81
DVR Size 1 and DVR Size 2	56	75
DVR Size 1 and DVR Size 3	41	69
DVR Size 2 and DVR Size 3	73	75
DVR Size 1 and Blind	60	81
DVR Size 2 and Blind	51	76
DVR Size 3 and Blind	47	70
Region NE and S	49	67
Region NE and MW	39	86
Region NE and W	34	64
Region S and MW	55	75
Region S and W	79	68
Region MW and W	55	77

* Decimal points in correlations omitted.

REFERENCES

Apostal, R. Two methods of evaluating vocational counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1960, 7, 171-175.

Bellows, R. Procedures for validating vocational criteria. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1941, 25, 499-513.

Bellows, R. Psychology of personnel in business and industry. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1949.

Bendig, A. Rater experience and case history judgments of adjustments. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1955, 11, 127-133.

Bendig, A., & Sprague, J. Rater experience and the reliability of case history ratings of adjustment. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1954, 18, 207-211.

Blalock, H. Social statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Brams, J. Counselor characteristics and effective communication in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1961, 8, 25-30.

Brayfield, A. H., & Crockett, W. H. Employee attitudes and employee performance. Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 396-424.

Brogden, H., & Taylor, E. The theory and classification of criterion bias. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1950, 10, 159-186.

Carlson, R. E., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. The measurement of employment satisfaction. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, XIII. Minneapolis: Industrial Relations Center, 1962.

Carlson, R. E., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. The measurement of employment satisfactoriness. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, XIV. Minneapolis: Industrial Relations Center, 1963.

Cohen, L. Vocational planning and mental illness. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1955, 34, 28-32.

Coker, D. L. A study of the effects of training residence hall advisers in interview procedures. Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Iowa, 1961.

Cronbach, L. J., & Gleser, G. C. Assessing similarity between profiles. Psychological Bulletin, 1953, 50, 456-473.

Deterline, W., & Bendig, A. The interdependence of ratings of case histories. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1956, 12, 79-82.

DiMichael, S. G. Work satisfaction and work efficiency of vocational counselors as related to measured interests. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1949, 33, 319-339.

Dollard, J., & Mowrer, O. A method of measuring tension in written documents. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1947, 42, 3-32.

Ebel, R. Estimation of the reliability of ratings. Psychometrika, 1951, 16, 407-424.

Eddy, R. T. Interest patterns of rehabilitation counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1960, 7, 202-211.

England, G. Development and use of weighted blanks. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1961.

Flanagan, J. Critical requirements: a new approach to employee evaluation. Personnel Psychology, 1949, 2, 419-425.

Garner, W. Uncertainty and structure as psychological concepts. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Gaylord, R. H., & Stunkel, E.R. Validity and the criterion. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1954, 14, 294-300.

Ghiselli, E. Differentiation of tests in terms of the accuracy with which they predict for a given individual. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1960, 20, 675-684.

Ghiselli, E., & Brown, C. Personnel and industrial psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1955.

Githens, W. Research findings and methodology in the United States Navy. Paper read at American Psychological Association convention, September, 1965.

Grant, C. W. The counselor's role. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1954, 33, 74-77.

Guilford, J. Psychometric methods. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.

Guilford, J. Fundamental statistics in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Gulliksen, H. Theory of mental tests. New York: John Wiley, 1950.

Habbe, S. Appraisal of job performance. National Industrial Conference Board Reports, No. 121. New York: Author, 1951.

Hahn, M. E. The training of rehabilitation counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1954, 1, 246-248.

Hansen, R. W. An investigation into the relationship of some personality characteristics with the tendency of rehabilitation counselor trainees to enter employment in a rehabilitation setting. Unpublished M.A. Equivalency, University of Iowa, 1961.

Hall, J. H., & Warren, S. L. (Eds.) Rehabilitation counselor preparation. Washington, D.C.: National Rehabilitation Association and National Vocational Guidance Association, 1956.

Heron, A. Satisfaction and satisfactoriness: complementary aspects of occupational adjustment. Occupational Psychology, 1954, 28, 140-153.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R. O., & Capwell, Dora F. Job attitudes: review of research and opinion. Pittsburgh: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh, 1957.

Hobbs, N. The development of a code of ethical standards for psychology. American Psychologist, 1958, 3, 80-84.

Hulin, C. L., & Smith, Patricia C. Sex differences in job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1964, 48, 88-92.

Jacobs, J. The application of sociometry to industry. Sociometry, 1945, 8, 181-198.

Jaques, Marceline E. Critical counseling behavior in rehabilitation settings. Iowa City, Iowa: University of Iowa, 1959.

Jenkins, J. Validity for what? Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1946, 10, 93-98.

Jensen, B., Coles, G., & Nestor, B. The criterion problem in guidance research. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1955, 2, 58-61.

Jensen, B., Terebinski, S. J., & Ellis, W. R. The importance of criterion definition. Journal of American Society of Training Directors, 1960, 2, 3-7.

Johnson, B. Role conflict in rehabilitation counseling. Unpublished doctoral dissertaion, University of Missouri, 1961.

Johnson, G. An instrument for the measurement of job satisfaction. Personnel Psychology, 1955, 8, 27-37.

Johnson, R. H., & Patterson, C. H. Vocational objectives for the emotionally disabled. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1957, 4, 291-296.

Johnston, L. T. The counselor as he really is. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1957, 33, 9-10.

Kahn, R. L. Productivity and job satisfaction. Personnel Psychology, 1960, 13, 275-287.

Katzell, R. A. Personal values, job satisfaction, and job behavior. In H. Borow (Ed.), Man in a world at work. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964. Pp. 341-363.

Katzell, R. A., Barrett, R. S., & Treadway, C. Job satisfaction, job performance, and situational characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1961, 45, 65-72.

Kelley, H.H., & Thibaut, J.W. Experimental studies of group problem solving and process. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook of social psychology. Vol. 2. Special fields and applications. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954. Pp. 735-785.

Kirchner, W., & Dunnette, M. Applying the weighted application blank technique to a variety of office jobs. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1957, 41, 206-208.

Lindquist, E. F. Design and analysis of experiments. Cambridge, Mass.: Riverside Press, 1953.

Lindzey, G., & Borgatta, E. Sociometric measurement. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook of Social psychology. Vol. 1. Theory and Method. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954. Pp. 405-448.

McAlees, D. C., & Warren, S. L. Increasing the supply of qualified rehabilitation counseling personnel in state vocational rehabilitation agencies. Unpublished manuscript, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1965.

McGowan, J. F. The counselor as others see him. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1957, 23 (May-June), 7-9.

Miller, L. A. A study of a case-review criterion for evaluating rehabilitation counselor performance. Unpublished doctoral dissertaion, University of Iowa, 1963.

Moed, G. Procedures and practices in pre-vocational evaluation: a review of current programs. In J. Muthard (Ed.), Proceedings of the Iowa conference on pre-vocational activities. Iowa City, Iowa: University of Iowa, 1960.

Moriarty, E. The supervisor in a state rehabilitation agency. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1959, 25, 2, 24-25.

Mosel, J., & Wade, R. A weighted application blank for reduction of turnover in department store sales-clerks. Personnel Psychology, 1951, 4, 177-184.

Muthard, J. E., & Miller, L. A. Evaluation of rehabilitation counselor performance: a survey of state agency practices. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1963, 42, 274-279.

Muthard, J. E., & Miller, L. A. Criteria for rehabilitation counselor performance in state vocational rehabilitation agencies. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1964, 11, 123-128.

Nagle, B. Criterion development. Personnel Psychology, 1953, 6, 271-289.

National Industrial Conference Board. Studies in personnel policy. Personnel Practices in Factory and Office. No. 145. New York: Author, 1954.

Newton, R. The clinician as judge: total Rorschach and clinical case material. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1954, 18, 248-250.

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. The measurement of meaning. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Patterson, C. H. Counselor or coordinator? Journal of Rehabilitation, 1957, 23 (May-June), 13-15.

Patterson, C. H. Counseling the emotionally disturbed. New York: Harper, 1958.

Patterson, C. H. Test characteristics of rehabilitation counselor trainees. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1962, 28, 5, 15-16.

Remmers, H. Rating methods in research on teaching. In N. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963. Pp. 329-378.

Robinson, H. Job satisfaction researches of 1955. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1956, 34, 565-568.

Robinson, H. Job satisfaction researches of 1956. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1957, 36, 34-37.

Robinson, H. Job satisfaction researches of 1958. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1959, 37, 669-673.

Robinson, H., & Conners, R. P. Job satisfaction researches of 1961. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1962, 41, 240-246.

Robinson, H., & Conners, R. P. Job satisfaction researches of 1962. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1963, 42, 136-142.

Ross, I., & Zander, A. Need satisfaction and employee turnover. Personnel Psychology, 1957, 10, 327-338.

Rusalem, H. An analysis of the functions of state vocational rehabilitation counselors with implications for the development of a training course at teachers college. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951.

Schubert, M. Field work performance: achievement levels of first-year students in selected aspects of casework service. Social Service Review, 1958, 32, 120-137.

Scott, T. B., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. A definition of work adjustment. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, X. Minneapolis: Industrial Relations Center, 1960.

Scurlock, V. Supervision in state rehabilitation agencies. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1958, 24, 4, 7-9.

Severin, D. The predictability of various kinds of criteria. Personnel Psychology, 1952, 5, 93-104.

Sluckin, W. Combining criteria of occupational success: Part I. Occupational Psychology, 1956, 30, 20-26.

Sluckin, W. Combining criteria of occupational success: Part II. Occupational Psychology, 1956, 30, 57-68.

Smith, C. E. A survey of opinion upon the occupational role of the rehabilitation counselor. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1960.

Smits, S. J. Rehabilitation counselor recruitment study: final report. Washington, D.C.: National Rehabilitation Association, 1964.

Spencer, G. J., & Worthington, R. Validity of a projective technique in predicting sales effectiveness. Personnel Psychology, 1952, 5, 125-144.

Super, D. The criteria of vocational success. Occupations, 1951, 30, 5-9.

Swineford, F. The measurement of a personality trait. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1938, 29, 295-300.

Tate, M. Statistics in education. New York: Macmillan, 1955.

Taylor, E., & Hastman, R. Relation of format and administration to the characteristics of graphic rating scales. Personnel Psychology, 1956, 9, 181-206.

Thorndike, R. (Ed.). Research problems and techniques, Report No. 3, Army Air Forces Aviation Psychology Program. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1947.

Thorndike, R. Personnel selection. New York: John Wiley, 1949.

Thorndike, R. Reliability. In E. Lindquist (Ed.), Educational measurement. Menasha, Wis.: George Banta, 1951. Pp. 560-620.

Truax, W. E. Critical requirements of small school counselors. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1956, 35, 103-106.

Tryon, R. C. Cluster analysis. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Edward Bros., 1939.

Vallance, T., Glickman, A. S., & Suci, G. J. Criterion rationale for a personnel research program. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1953, 37, 429-431.

Wagner, R. F. A study of the critical requirements for dentists. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1949.

Warren, S. L. The rehabilitation counselor today. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1959, 25, 5, 7-9.

Wherry, R. Criteria and validity. In D. H. Fryer & E. Henry (Eds.), Handbook of applied psychology. New York: Rinehart, 1950. Pp. 170-176.

Wherry, R. The past and future of criterion evaluation. Personnel Psychology, 1957, 10, 1-5.

Wherry, R., & Fryer, D. H. Buddy ratings: popularity contest or leadership criteria? Sociometry, 1949, 12, 179-190.

Wolfe, E. W. Staff evaluations: a key to effective performance. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1960, 26, 4, 19-22.

Ziller, R. Vocational choice and utility for risk. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1957, 4, 61-64.